

UMHEP-371/revised
hep-th/9205061
May, 1992

Quantum-Mechanical Scattering of Charged Black Holes

JENNIE TRASCHEN

*Department of Physics
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts*

and

ROBERT FERRELL

*Department of Physics
University of California
Santa Barbara, California*

ABSTRACT

We describe the quantum mechanical scattering of slowly moving maximally charged black holes. Our technique is to develop a canonical quantization procedure on the parameter space of possible static classical solutions. With this, we compute the capture cross sections for the scattering of two black holes. Finally, we discuss how quantization on this parameter space relates to quantization of the degrees of freedom of the gravitational field.

1. Introduction

Here we study quantum mechanical interactions of charged black holes. In classical general relativity there exist exact static solutions for N maximally charged black holes; the black holes can be placed anywhere, and will remain at rest. This suggests that for slowly moving maximally charged black holes, the spatial geometry at any time will be well approximated by the static solution for the black hole configuration at that time. The classical solutions were worked out [2] following this type of adiabatic approach. Now, the parameter or moduli space of possible static solutions is a $3N$ dimensional manifold, consisting of the positions of the N black holes. Therefore, for the slowly moving black holes, a path is traced out in moduli space as the 3- geometry evolves to the 4-dimensional spacetime.

In studying the classical solutions it was found that the motion of the black holes was governed by an effective Hamiltonian for N point particles. The approach here is to use this Hamiltonian to evolve a Schroedinger wave function, for the case of two black holes. The wave function is a function of the positions of the two black holes, that is, the configuration space of the wavefunction is the parameter space of possible classical static solutions. Hence the degree of freedom being quantized is the proper distance between the two black holes.

One can imagine that if the full theory for quantum gravity were known, one could compute the motion of maximally charged black holes and then consider the slow motion, low energy limit. Here, we can hope that we are computing an approximation to the actual motion. Of course, since we do not know the theory of quantum gravity we have no way of knowing how good an approximation this is. On the other hand, we do know of some ways this approximation may fail. In particular, the classical metrics were assumed to have a particular form, corresponding to slow motion. However, in the full quantum theoretic description of the system, there will surely be excitation of degrees of freedom which are not included in this model, i.e., the configuration space for the true wave function must include other degrees of freedom than those in the moduli space considered here.

In our approximation we will never see these. This is similar to mini-superspace models, and also quantized non-linear sigma models (when viewed as models of approximately constrained systems), which suffer the same shortcoming. There is no way to excite modes which are not in the approximation.[1]

Perhaps the most interesting issue is the meaning of the wavefunction for the geometry of the spacetime. In the classical case the metric can be found by solving constraint equations, with the black hole positions and momenta as sources, after the motion of the black holes is known. When the sources are quantized, one can no longer speak of a position and velocity of the source, and instead must speak in terms of probabilities. The question, then, is what does it mean for the metric field equations to have sources which are probabilities? Our preferred interpretation, but by no means the only one, is to consider the probabilities as probabilities for finding different spacetimes. We discuss these issues in the final section.

2. The System for Scattering of Maximally Charged Black Holes

We now review the work of Ferrell and Eardley.[2] This section will conclude with the classical Hamiltonian for black holes. In the next section we will discuss the quantization procedure, e.g., the Hilbert space of states, and the quantum mechanical operator which corresponds to the classical Hamiltonian.

The sources in our study will be maximally charged black holes. A maximally charged black hole is an electrically charged (Reisner-Nordstrom) black hole with charge $Q = \sqrt{G}/M$. Such a black hole is maximally charged, since if Q is increased but M is held fixed, the event horizon which is associated with the black hole disappears and a naked singularity arises.

The theory for charged matter in curved space is assumed to be the coupled Einstein-Maxwell field theory. The action for this theory is [3]:

$$S = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int ({}^{(4)}R - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int F_{ab}F^{ab} + \int A_a j^a + \Sigma_i \int m_i d\tau_i \quad (2.1)$$

In this expression, ${}^{(4)}R$ is the scalar curvature of the spacetime, A_a is the electro-

magnetic four- potential, j^a is the electromagnetic current and $F_{ab} = \partial_a A_b - \partial_b A_a$ is the electromagnetic field strength. The last term is the action for a collection of free particles, and doesn't make sense for black holes. In deriving the classical effective action, Eardley and Ferrell replace the singularities with charged dust, with charge density equal to the mass density. So in performing the manipulations the sources are smooth. At the end of the derivation, the limit is taken in which the charge density goes to a sum of point singularities. This regularization scheme works because the dust is maximally charged, and hence in a static configuration. Dust with charge less than the mass would tend to collapse. For this paper we will not make the distinction between black holes and the smoothed distribution used to represent them. G is Newton's gravitational constant. In this paper we will work in units where $G = 1$ and $c = 1$. In these units $\hbar = m_{Planck}^2$ where m_{Planck} is the Planck mass.

In non-relativistic theories it is clear that there exists a static configuration of maximally charged black holes, since the condition for maximal charge is just the condition that the static gravitational attraction exactly cancel the electrostatic repulsion. Remarkably, in the full Einstein- Maxwell theory for gravitation coupled to electricity and magnetism there also can be static configurations of maximally charged black holes.

The metric that describes a system of N static maximally charged black holes (first discovered by Majumdar[4] and Papapetrou[5]) is:

$$ds^2 = -\Psi^{-2}dt^2 + \Psi^2\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\nabla^2\Psi = -4\pi\Sigma_a m_a\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_a)$ with the black holes at the points x_a and the boundary condition $\Psi = 1$ at infinity. Here ∇^2 is the Laplacian on the $\mathbf{x}$ regarded as coordinates on flat R^3 . In this coordinate system the hypersurfaces $t = \text{constant}$ intersect the singularities at the points $x = x_a$, and the event horizons are the same points (i.e., the event horizons are represented as points, but have surface

area $4\pi m_a$.) The Maxwell 4-potential is

$$A = -(1 - 1/\Psi)dt. \quad (2.3)$$

The space of possible Majumdar-Papapetrou metrics is the $3N$ dimensional configuration space of the positions of the black holes—once the x_a are known, Ψ is known and therefore the metric and scalar potential are also known. If the black holes are moving slowly then the solution will trace out a trajectory in the space of static solutions.[2,6] These quasi-static solutions exist because in the slow motion approximation radiation can be neglected:[3] The static forces cancel exactly, and the only relevant forces are the velocity dependent magnetic force and the gravitational analog, the gravito-magnetic force. As long as the velocities remain small, there will be very little radiation. In this approximation then, the fields are fully fixed by the positions and velocities of the matter sources. (A similar example of this approximation comes from electrodynamics in flat space. If the position of a charge q at $\mathbf{r}_0$ is changing slowly, with $\mathbf{v} = d\mathbf{r}_0/dt$, then the scalar potential is approximately $\phi(r, t) \approx q/|r - r_0(t)|$, and the vector potential is approximately $\mathbf{A} \approx q\mathbf{v}/|r - r_0(t)|$. The space of field configurations is just the configuration space for the particle, since a field configuration is determined by the position and velocity of the particle.)

To describe slowly moving black holes, one looks for a metric and four potential of the form

$$ds^2 = -\frac{1}{\Psi}dt^2 + 2N_i dx^i dt + \Psi^2 \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mathbf{A} = -(1 - \frac{1}{\Psi})dt + A_i dx^i \quad (2.5)$$

with Ψ as before, but now the x_a will be functions of time. Both N_i and A_i will depend on the velocities of the black holes. However, since we are assuming velocities are small we can truncate the field equations for N_i and A_i to first order in velocity.

Using the Einstein constraint equations, the fields N_i and A_i can be solved for in terms of the source positions and velocities. These expressions are substituted into the Einstein-Maxwell action (2.1). The resulting effective Lagrangian depends only on the positions and velocities of the sources. The black hole limit is shown to be well defined. This is the Lagrangian for the interaction of the black holes. For details see [2]. Finally, one finds that the Hamiltonian for two black holes, with masses m_1 and m_2 , is

$$H_{2-body} = \frac{1}{2M} \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{P} + \frac{1}{2\mu} g^{ab} p_a p_b. \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ is the momentum of the center of mass, $M = m_1 + m_2$, $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2$ is the relative coordinate, $\mathbf{p}$ is the momentum conjugate to that coordinate, and $\mu = m_1 m_2 / M$ is the reduced mass of the system. In the first term, a flat metric is implied. The metric in the second term is

$$g_{ab} = \gamma(r) \delta_{ab} \quad (2.7)$$

$$\gamma(r) = 1 + \frac{3M}{r} + \frac{3M^2}{r^2} + \frac{3\alpha M^3}{r^3} \quad (2.8)$$

where $\alpha = 1 - 2\mu/M$. (Recall that $\mathbf{R}$ is the position of the center of mass, and $\mathbf{r}$ is the relative position, hence these are coordinates on the moduli space of solutions, not on spacetime.)

The evolution of the center of mass coordinate is just free particle motion. The evolution for the relative coordinate can have one of two behaviors. If the two black holes start at infinite separation, then when they interact they can either scatter back out to infinity, or they can evolve toward zero separation, depending on their angular momentum. Although in the $r \rightarrow 0$ limit the slow motion approximation probably breaks down, it is reasonable to guess that in this case the two black holes coalesce into one black hole.[2,3] We will call the two possible classes of orbits scattering orbits or coalescence orbits, respectively. This completes the review of the classical behavior.

3. Solutions of the Schroedinger equation for Charged Black Holes

Now we will view the hamiltonian H_{2-body} , for the system of two maximally charged slowly moving black holes, as defining the evolution of a quantum mechanical system. Hence the system is described by a wave function. As in the classical case, the center of mass degrees of freedom X_c separate, so that the total wave function can be taken to be of the form $\Psi_{total} = \Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \exp i(-E_c t/\hbar + \mathbf{P}_c \cdot \mathbf{X}_c)$, where E_c and $\mathbf{P}_c$ are the center of mass energy and momentum, and $\mathbf{x}$ are the relative coordinates. Suppose that at early times a wave packet is given which has support at large relative coordinate r , so the two black holes are far apart. As time evolves the black holes approach each other, that is the wave packet evolves towards smaller r . Part of the packet will be scattered and part will be absorbed; classically of course the black holes either scatter or coalesce. Here we will compute the absorption coefficient as a function of the angular momentum and energy of the wave. The Schroedinger equation for the wave function of the relative coordinates is

$$-\frac{\hbar}{i} \dot{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}, t) = H\Psi - (E_c - \frac{\hbar^2 P_c^2}{2M} - M)\Psi, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$H = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} g^{ab} \nabla_a \nabla_b + \hbar^2 \xi \mathcal{R}$$

and

$$g_{ab} = \gamma(r) (dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2), \text{ and } \gamma(r) = 1 + \frac{3M}{r} + \frac{3M^2}{r^2} + \frac{\alpha M^3}{r^3}.$$

$\mathcal{R}$ is the scalar curvature of the three-metric g_{ab} , and $\alpha = 1 - 2\mu/M$. The Hilbert space of states can be taken to be square integrable functions. We will see that the energy eigenfunctions are square integrable as $r \rightarrow 0$. As $r \rightarrow \infty$, the eigenfunctions become plane waves, so just as usual, one would need to form wave packets in the free particle regime. When checking that H is hermitian, one finds that boundary term contributions of probability flux cancel, between large r and the horizon. This is similar to the cancellation for plane waves in a box.

We take the eigenfunctions to be of the form $\Psi_{qlm} = \psi_{ql}(r)Y_{lm}(\Omega)$, so that $H\Psi = E\Psi$ implies that the radial wave functions satisfy

$$\psi''(r) + \frac{2}{r}\psi' + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\gamma'}{\gamma}\psi'(r) - \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2}\psi - 2\mu\xi R\gamma(r)\psi = -q^2\gamma(r)\psi(r) \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$q^2 = \frac{2\mu E}{\hbar^2}.$$

It is useful to change to a new "tortoise" coordinate R , which measures actual length along the path. This casts the problem into the form of a standard one-dimensional quantum mechanical scattering problem, and the potential is better behaved. Let $R = \int \sqrt{\gamma}dr$ and let $\chi = r\gamma^{1/2}\psi$. Then the Schroedinger equation (3.1) becomes

$$\chi_{,RR} + (q^2 - V)\chi = 0 \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$V = \frac{1}{2r\gamma^3} (\gamma(r\gamma_{,r}),_r - r\gamma'^2) + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2\gamma} + 2\mu\xi\mathcal{R}. \quad (3.4)$$

For $\mu = 0$ we have

$$V = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{M^2} \frac{(r/M)^2}{(1+r/M)^5} + \frac{l(l+1)}{M^2} \frac{r/M}{(1+r/M)^3} \quad (3.5)$$

Here r is an implicit function of R . The new coordinate R ranges from $-\infty$ at the horizon to $+\infty$; $R \simeq r + \frac{3}{2}M \ln \frac{r}{M}$ for $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $R \simeq -2\sqrt{\alpha}M(r/M)^{-1/2}$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. For the remainder of the paper we will treat the case $\xi = 0$. We find, valid for all μ ,

$$V \simeq \frac{3}{2} \frac{M}{R^3} + \frac{l(l+1)}{R^2}, \text{ for } R \gg M \quad (3.6)$$

$$V \simeq 24 \frac{M^2}{R^4} + \frac{4l(l+1)}{R^2}, \text{ for } R \ll -M.$$

Hence the potential falls off rapidly both in the asymptotic free region and as the horizon is approached. If we think of the problem as the quantum mechanics of

a particle on a curved surface, the three-geometry on which the particle moves becomes, as the horizon is approached, flat space minus a three-dimensional wedge of solid angle $4\pi/4 = \pi$. Hence the eigenfunctions behave like free particles on either side of the potential barrier, $\chi \simeq e^{\pm iqR}$ as $R \rightarrow \pm\infty$. We want solutions to (3.3) for the eigenfunctions with the boundary conditions that χ is purely a captured, left-moving wave as $R \rightarrow -\infty$, so there is no flux out of the horizon. Then as $R \rightarrow \infty$ the solution will be the sum of an incident wave e^{-iqR} , normalized to unit amplitude, and a scattered wave Se^{iqR} . Using the asymptotic form of the potential (3.6), we find

$$\chi_{ql} \simeq qR[(-i)^{l+1}h_l^{(2)}(qR) + S_{ql}h_l^{(1)}(qR)] , \quad R \gg M \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\chi_{ql} \simeq C_{ql}qRh_\nu^{(2)}(qR) , \quad R \ll -M \quad (3.8)$$

where $\nu = \sqrt{4l(l+1) + 1/4} - 1/2$. Hence the fraction of captured flux is $|C_{ql}|^2$ and the scattered flux is $|S_{ql}|^2 = 1 - |C_{ql}|^2$.

4. General Properties of the Solutions

First let us consider the motion of wavepackets, so each eigenmode evolves like

$$\exp(-i\hbar q^2 t/2\mu).$$

At early times, let a wave packet start in the asymptotic free region, $R \rightarrow \infty$, $t \rightarrow -\infty$. Then by looking at the point of stationary phase, one sees that initially the center of the packet moves inward according to $R \simeq -v_\infty t$, where $v_\infty = \hbar q/\mu$ is the nonrelativistic (relative coordinate) velocity at infinity, associated with the momentum $\hbar q$. At large times the wave packet has split into two pieces. The center of one part continues towards $R \rightarrow -\infty$ as $R \simeq -2v_\infty t$; this is the captured flux, corresponding to classical coalescence of the black holes. Hence it takes an infinite

amount of t -coordinate time for coalescence. There is also a scattered part of the packet, propagating as $R \simeq v_\infty t$. Hence the motion of the center of the packet is like the classical solution. The motion along the classical path depends only on a rescaled time, $s = v_\infty t$, and so the parameter v_∞ scales out of the problem. Hence the classical solutions depend only on the impact parameter b . However, quantum mechanically the quantities of physical interest such as the scattering coefficient, will depend on v_∞ (or equivalently, q) as well as the analogue of b . Indeed, from the eigenfunction equation (3.3) we see that the eigenfunctions depend on the two dimensionless parameters qM and $\frac{b}{M}$, where

$$\frac{b}{M} = \frac{\sqrt{l(l+1)}}{qM} \quad (4.1)$$

or equivalently on l and qM . The definition of $\frac{b}{M}$ comes from equating the quantum mechanical angular momentum $\hbar\sqrt{l(l+1)}$ with the classical angular momentum $\mu v_\infty b$. Finally, note that the slow motion approximation $v_\infty \ll 1$ is equivalent to

$$\hbar q \ll \mu \quad (4.2)$$

that is, the (quantum mechanical) particle is nonrelativistic. Although we don't have sufficient control of the solutions for the eigenfunctions, to actually match the two asymptotic regions, we can determine the scaling with qM of the coefficients C_{ql} and S_{ql} in the low energy limit. Then in the next section we will use different techniques to get approximate forms for C and S in essentially all qM and l regimes. Now, suppose $qM \ll 1$. Then for $|R| < 1/q$, the solutions to (3.3) are (approximately) independent of q . The solution in the region $M < R < 1/q$ inherits an overall scaling dependence on qM from the large R solution (3.7). Hence this same scaling with qM is passed onto the solution in the region $-1/q < R < -M$, which can then be matched onto the large negative R region. One finds, for $qM \ll 1$ and all l ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ql} &\simeq (-i)^{l+1} + O(qM)^{2l+2} \\ C_{ql} &\simeq \frac{(-i)^{l+1} \pi \gamma_l}{2^{\nu+l} \Gamma(\nu + \frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(l + \frac{3}{2})} (qM)^{\nu+l+1} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where γ_l is an unknown coefficient which is independent of q . For large l then, the capture coefficient is

$$|C_{ql}|^2 \simeq \frac{\pi^2 e^{6l}}{l^2 2^{10l-1}} |\gamma_l|^2 \left(\frac{qM}{l} \right)^{6l+3}, l \gg 1, qM \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$|C_{q0}|^2 \propto (qM)^2, \text{ for } l = 0.$$

(A similar analysis in the case of a Klein-Gordon field scattering off a Schwarzschild background yields $|C_{ql}|^2 \propto (qM)^{2l+2}$.) Therefore at low energies the only significant capture occurs for $l = 0$ waves.

5. Approximate Methods for finding C_{ql}

We now turn to the calculation of the capture coefficient. When the energy of the particle is well over the potential barrier one can use the Born approximation, and the WKB approximation when the particle is well under the barrier, for $l \gg 1$. For $l = 0$ and low energies, one can use another approximation where the potential is replaced by a delta-function. For a given l and qM one has to solve a cubic equation to decide if the particle is over or under the barrier. In the case $\mu = 0$ this simplifies. If $l = 0$, then the particle is over the barrier if $qM > .23$. For $l \geq 1$, the particle is over the barrier – and hence primarily captured – if $qM > \frac{2}{5}\sqrt{l(l+1)}$, which is equivalent to $\frac{b}{M} < 2.5$. (Recall that in the classical case, the coalescence occurs if the impact parameter is less than $2.5M$.)

a) Low Energies

In the small qM regime one looks for wave functions of the form $|S'|^{-1/2} e^{iS}$. In the first WKB or adiabatic approximation, $S = -\int^R (q^2 - V)^{1/2} dR'$, for a wave propagating in from $R = +\infty$. This neglects terms of order $|\frac{\partial V}{\partial R}| |q^2 - V|^{-3/2}$, which are small except near the classical turning points R_a and R_b where $q^2 = V$. Further, for the WKB approximation to be valid, the width of the potential $R_b - R_a$

must be large compared to the wavelength of the incident particle. For $l \neq 0$ and small incident energies, $qM \ll 2/5\sqrt{l(l+1)}$, then $R_a \simeq -2l(l+1)/R^2$ and $R_b \simeq l(l+1)/R^2$, so the WKB approximation is valid if $\sqrt{l(l+1)} \gg 2$. For $l = 0$ WKB is never valid; one can't fit several wavelengths in under the barrier. Then using the standard WKB matching formulae one finds the capture coefficient for the case when the particle is well under the barrier, and $\sqrt{l(l+1)} \gg 2$,

$$|C_{ql}|^2 = 4 \left(2\theta + \frac{1}{2\theta} \right)^{-2} \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$\ln \theta = \int_{R_a}^{R_b} dR (V - q^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In the intervals $R_a < R < -M$ and $M < R < R_b$, V goes like $1/R^2$, and the integration can be done exactly. In the remaining region of integration, q^2 can be neglected compared to V , and the value is approximately $\int_{-M}^M dR \sqrt{V} \simeq l$ (which actually turns out to be a fair estimate from doing the integral numerically). Using the values for R_a and R_b given above, and keeping terms of leading order in qM/l , we find

$$|C_{ql}|^2 \approx \frac{1}{\theta^2} \approx \left(\frac{qm}{l} \right)^{6l+3} \frac{e^{4l}}{2^{10l+5}}, \quad l \gg 1, \quad \frac{qM}{l} \ll 1. \quad (5.2)$$

The dependence on qM in (5.2) agrees with the expression which was derived from scaling arguments (4.1) (Indeed, one can now approximate the unknown coefficient $|\kappa_l|^2 \approx l^2 e^{-2l}/\pi^2 2^6$.) The important point is that the capture coefficient is very small; performing the integral numerically one finds the capture coefficient equals zero to 5 significant figures, in ranges where the WKB approximation is reliable.

For $l = 0$ and energies below the potential barrier we must use a different technique. In this case the wavelength of the incident wave is much greater than the width of the potential, as long as $qM \ll 1$, that is, M is small compared to the

deBroglie wavelength $\sqrt{2\mu E}/\hbar$. (In this regime there is no particular additional constraint for consistency with the slow velocity requirement (4.2). It is sufficient, that $\mu M/\hbar = \mu M/m_{Plank}^2$ is less than or of order one.) This long wavelength wave is not sensitive to the details of the potential and the potential in (3.4) can be replaced by a delta-function, $V \rightarrow LV_0\delta(R)$, with strength fixed by $LV_0 = \int dRV(R)$.

This problem can be solved, and the capture coefficient is

$$|C_{q0}|^2 = (1 + (\frac{LV_0}{2q})^2)^{-1} \approx (1 + (\frac{10^{-2}}{qM})^2)^{-1}, \quad l = 0, \quad qm \ll 1 \quad (5.3)$$

It is simple to estimate LV_0 to be a few times $10^{-2}/M^2$, and numerical integration gives $LV_0 = 2 \cdot 10^{-2}/M^2$. As $qM \rightarrow 0$ the capture coefficient goes like $(qM)^2$, which agrees with the previous result derived from scaling arguments.

Classically, if the two black holes approach each other with zero angular momentum, they always coalesce. In the quantum mechanical system, for incident energies of $qM = .1, .01$ and $.001$, the $l = 0$ mode has a capture coefficient of $.99, .50$ and $.001$ respectively. The behavior interpolates between almost complete capture, as one expects for a particle, to complete scattering to the asymptotic free region, as is characteristic of a wave. At very long wavelengths the wave barely "sees" the black hole.

In summary, for incident energies under the barrier we can easily compute the captured flux from (5.3), and the higher angular momentum waves are almost completely scattered. Only the $l = 0$ mode has a non-negligible capture coefficient. This is not too surprising since an angular momentum barrier is hard to tunnel through. ((5.3) can also be used for incident energies over the barrier, $.23 < qM < 1$, where it gives a capture coefficient of essentially unity. This agrees with the results of the high energy approach discussed next.)

b) High Energies

For energies high compared to the height of the potential the simplest approximation is the Born approximation, which appears to be sufficient here. To this

end, we rewrite the eigenfunction equation as an integral equation

$$\xi(R) = \xi^0(R) + \int dR' G(R, R') V(R') \xi(R'), \quad (5.4)$$

where $\xi^0(R)$ is any solution to the equation with the potential set to zero, and $G(R, R')$ is the Green function for that equation. For the no-flux-out-of-the-horizon boundary conditions as before one takes $\xi^0 = e^{-iqR}$ and

$$G(R, R') = \frac{e^{iq(R-R')}}{2iq}, \text{ for } R > R'$$

$$G(R, R') = \frac{e^{-iq(R-R')}}{2iq}, \text{ for } R < R'.$$

Substituting into (5.4), we have ξ as the sum of an ingoing and an outgoing wave, and hence can deduce the scattering and capture coefficients, S and C . It is simple to check that this approximation does not conserve probability. However, if one computes S and C to second order, probability is conserved. Furthermore, only C gets a correction at this order. S is already correct to second order, so it suffices to compute S to first order and derive $|C|^2$ from $|C|^2 = 1 - |S|^2$.

The range of validity of the Born approximation is

$$qM \gg .23, \text{ if } l = 0$$

$$qM \gg (2/5)\sqrt{l(l+1)} \text{ if } l > 0.$$

In these ranges one has

$$|S_{ql}|^2 = \frac{1}{4q^2} \left| \int dR V(R) e^{-2iqR} \right|^2 \quad (5.5)$$

The integral is approximately zero where the Born approximation is valid: the width of the potential at half-maximum is about $3M$, which means that for $qM \gg$

1, the exponential in the integrand is rapidly oscillating and different contributions cancel. We computed the integral numerically and indeed one finds that, for $qM \geq 10$, once the particle is over the barrier, the scattering coefficient is zero to five significant figures.

c) Summary of Scattering Behavior

For $qM \geq 10$ we see particle like behavior. Recall that the condition for the wave to be over the barrier, and hence captured, is

$$\frac{b}{M} = \frac{\sqrt{l(l+1)}}{qM} \leq 2.5,$$

which is the same as the classical condition for coalescence. For high enough energies the discreteness of l is no longer important; a sketch of the capture coefficient vs. l looks very much like the plot of capture vs. a continuous b/M . Thus, for high energies, $|C|^2 \approx 1$ for $b/M < 2.5$. For $b/M \geq 3$, where we know the WKB approximation is valid, $|C|^2 \approx 0$. Indeed, $|C|^2$ is probably close to zero at an impact parameter closer to 2.5 than 3.

At intermediate energies, $.23 \leq qM \leq 10$, q^2 is still above the potential barrier for some l -values. As l , or b , is increased, $|C|^2$ decreases from (nearly) unity to (nearly) zero. The transition from the Born regime, where $|C|^2 \approx 1$, to the WKB, where $|C|^2 \approx 0$, is not as sharp as in the high energy case. For $qM = .5$ this transition occurs over a change in b of about $14M$, compared to $M/2$ above. For $qM < .23$, we see transition to wave-like behavior, as previously discussed. The wave is almost completely scattered, the captured flux going to zero like $(qM)^{6l+3}$ for large l and as $(qM)^2$ for $l = 0$.

Apriori, one might expect more back scattering in the over-the-barrier case and more capture in the under-the-barrier case than we have found; except for the lowest angular momentum modes, the transition from a capture coefficient of 1 to 0 is quite abrupt in b/M . This is due to the "featurelessness" of the black hole potential. There is only one length scale, M , which determines both the height

and the width of the potential. Typically in scattering problems there are two independent parameters to vary.

One can also think of the over-the-barrier condition as fixing q and letting M increase, since the analysis is valid in a strong gravity regime. Then, as one expects for a black hole, once particle flux is in, it never gets out. Note that because of the slow motion approximation (4.2), in the regime $qM > 1$ one can only consider black holes with masses such that

$$\frac{\mu M}{\hbar} + \frac{\mu M}{m_{\text{planck}}^2} > 1, \quad (5.6)$$

in the case when the particle is over the barrier.

6. Discussion

At this point the most interesting question is, what has been quantized? When solving the classical problem one first solves for the trajectories of the black holes which immediately gives the diagonal metric components and the time component of the Maxwell potential. Then one finds (at least in principle) the other field components by solving given constraint equations, in which the black hole positions and velocities appear as source terms.[2] The complete solution can be found in this sequence of steps because of the slow motion approximation.

In the present calculation we have quantized the distance between the two black holes. Instead of having a solution $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{t})$ which is this distance as a function of time, one now has an amplitude $\Psi(r, t)$.

This is fundamentally different from calculations in which "gravitons" are quantized as linear perturbations off some fixed classical background (typically Minkowski or Robertson Walker). In the charged black hole problem, one of the degrees of freedom of the full metric has been quantized, not just a fluctuation. To see this, just write the spacetime metric (2.4) in coordinates such that one of

the black holes is at the origin and the other is at comoving coordinate z , so that one of the metric components is $r(t) = a(t)z$, the distance between the two black holes.

On the other hand, we have not allowed for quantum fluctuations in "directions in the space of metrics" other than this single function. In a fully quantum mechanical theory one must allow all the field components to vary from the classical values. The situation is similar to the quantization of a nonlinear sigma model. Suppose we have a classical theory in D dimensions (or with D fields) with a strong potential that approximately constrains the dynamics to a $D - 1$ dimensional submanifold with metric g_{ab} . This leads us to model the system by the sigma model $L = g^{ab}\nabla_a\phi\nabla_b\phi$, where ϕ is constrained to take values on the $D - 1$ dimensional submanifold. Quantizing the sigma model also misses out on quantum fluctuations in directions off the submanifold. One expects that quantizing the reduced system is a good approximation to the full system, if the constraining potential is sufficiently strong. In the black hole problem this corresponds to the slow motion approximation remaining good.

An alternative way to say this, is that the approximation made here is the same as in "mini superspace" models. In these quantum cosmology models, the wave function is taken to depend on only one metric component, namely the scale factor.

We also note that in deriving our black hole Hamiltonian, H_{eff} , the classical equations of motion have been inserted into the action. Now, it was checked by Eardly that to derive the classical effective Hamiltonian, one could either work exclusively with the equations of motion, or with the action and equations of motion for some of the fields, as described earlier. However, since all field configurations contribute to a functional integral, one expects that use of the classical equations for N_i and A_i also leads to differences from a full quantum theory. Again, this is similar to the sigma model approximation discussed above.

Next, what about the other fields in the problem? We suggest that the prescrip-

tion for recovering the metric and electro-magnetic fields from the wave function for the black hole coordinates is similar to the prescription for recovering the states of Schroedinger's cat in that famous demonstration of quantum mechanics.[11] That is, observed macroscopic states occur with probabilities predicted by quantum mechanics, but are not superpositions of multiple quantum mechanical states. Suppose for particular initial conditions of the wave function there is a scattering coefficient, p . Then at late times, according to this prescription, one observes fields due to two widely separated black holes with masses m_1 and m_2 with probability p , and the set of fields corresponding to one large black hole with mass M , with probability $1 - p$. That is, one predicts that certain field configurations occur with certain probabilities.

An alternative prescription would be to couple the classical fields to the expectation value of the charge operator. Then, e.g., x would be the sum of two Coulombic pieces, with widely separated poles, one with strength $m_1 + m_2(1 - p)$ and the other with strength m_2p . That is, the resulting fields are prescribed deterministically, and correspond to sources where "part of the black holes coalesced and part scattered", rather than different classical configurations occurring with different probabilities.

Clearly in the gravitational problem one can only argue by analogy and according to what we observe at accessible energies, to choose the theory for specifying the classical fields. At this point in our understanding of quantum gravity, we leave the choice to the sense and sensibility of the reader.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Doug Eardley and Gary Horowitz for frequent thoughtful and helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

1. G. Gibbons and N. Manton, *Nucl. Phys. B* 274, 183 (1986).
2. R.C. Ferrell and D.M. Eardley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 59, 1617 (1987). R.C. Ferrell and D.M. Eardley, "Slowly Moving, Maximally Charged Black Holes", In: *Frontiers in Numerical Relativity*, ed. C. Evans, L. Finn and D. Hobill, (Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 27ff.
3. R.C. Ferrell and D. Eardley, "Slow Motion Interactions of Maximally Charged Black Holes", NSF-ITP Preprint 88-000.
4. S.D. Majumdar, *Phys. Rev.* 72, 39 (1947).
5. A. Papapetrou, *Proc. Irish Acad. Sci., Sec. A* 51, 191 (1947).
6. N.S. Manton, *Phys. Lett. B* 110, 54 (1982); G. Gibbons and P. Ruback, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 57, 1492 (1986).
7. We are indebted to Gary Horowitz for providing us with some notes of R. Geroch and R. Wald which helped clarify this point.
8. L. Parker, *Phys. Rev. D* 19, 438 (1979).
9. B. Harrison, K. Thorne, M. Wakano, J. Wheeler, *Gravitation Theory and Gravitational Collapse* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965).
10. K. Gottfried, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. I, (Benjamin/Cummings, London, 1974).
11. See, e.g., Schroedinger's article in *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, ed. J.A. Wheeler and W.H. Zurek (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1983).